

REMARKS

This amendment is filed responsive to the Office Action mailed July 14, 2009. Claims 22-50 were pending and rejected on various grounds. In the present amendment and response, applicants have amended independent Claim 22 to more particularly recite the subject matter that applicants consider their invention. Claims 23-50 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicants have added new Claims 51-58, which all depend from amended Claim 22. Applicants have further added new Claim 59, which is a method claim generally corresponding to the system of Claim 22. New Claims 60-67 have also been added to depend from Claim 59 and to generally correspond to dependent Claims 51-58, respectively. Thus, Claims 22 and 51-67 are now pending and submitted herewith for the Examiner's consideration.

A. A Terminal Disclaimer Is Filed to Overcome a Nonstatutory Double Patenting Rejection.

In the Office Action, Claims 22-50 were provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-20 of co-pending Application No. 12/059,990. In response, applicants submit herewith a duly executed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). Withdrawal of this basis of rejection is respectfully requested.

B. Claim 22, as Amended, and Claims 51-67 Are Patentable Over Yamanami et al. and Others.

In the Office Action, Claim 22, among other claims, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamanami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,028,745). Still other claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Yamanami et al. in view of Ronkka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,387), Katsurahira (U.S. Patent No. 5,679,930), Murakami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,848,496), Katsurahira et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,555), and/or Iwamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,600,720).

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

Applicants have reviewed the cited references, in particular Yamanami et al., and submit that Claim 22, as amended, is novel and non-obvious in view of the cited prior art of record. In this regard, prior to discussing why amended Claim 22 is patentable over the prior art, a brief description of exemplary embodiments of the present invention is set forth below. It should be understood that the following is provided merely to assist the Examiner's understanding of the present invention and is not intended to limit the scope of the claims.

Referring to FIGURE 8 of the present application, a surface and cordless transducer system according to exemplary embodiments of the present invention includes a surface including a position resolving grid 18 *and* a power transmission coil 12 that is distinct from the position resolving grid 18. Specifically, the application describes:

The example chosen for illustration incorporates a tablet grid of orthogonally arranged position sensing conductors 18 used to derive position information of a transmitting transducer such as a pen. The conductors are selectively addressed using well known addressing techniques including X and Y switches 20 and 21, respectively, and position information is derived from the resulting signals. *The present invention provides power to such pens or transducers through the power transmit grid 12 comprising overlapping tuned powering loops 24.*

(Specification, page 20, lines 24-31, emphasis added.)

Claim 22, as amended, explicitly recites a surface and cordless transducer system comprising:

a surface including a position resolving grid, and

a transducer including a power receiving circuit, wherein the power receiving circuit responds to an electromagnetic field radiating from the surface and sends a transmit signal, which is received by the position resolving grid and used to determine a position of the transducer relative to the surface,

wherein the surface further includes a power transmission coil, which is distinct from the position resolving grid, for radiating the electromagnetic field, the power transmission coil being a resonant power transmission coil and consisting of a plurality of overlapping coils.

Yamanami et al., on the other hand, describes a position detecting apparatus including a position detecting section 10 consisting of a plurality of loop coils 11-1 to 11-48. (FIG. 1, Col. 3, lines 45-55.) "The connection switching circuit 30 is adapted to connect the loop coil selected by the selection circuit 20 alternate[ly] to the transmission circuit 40 and the receiving circuit 50." (Col. 4, lines 9-12.) Then, "the processing device 70 computes the coordinates values representing the position of the input pen 60 by processing these stored voltage values [corresponding to the distances between the input pen 60 and the respective loop coils]." (Col. 7, lines 20-57.) Thus, in Yamanami et al., the "position detecting section 10" corresponds to the "position resolving grid" of amended Claim 22. Yamanami et al., however, nowhere discloses or suggests providing a "power transmission coil, which is distinct from the position resolving grid, for radiating the electromagnetic field, the power transmission coil being a resonant power transmission coil and consisting of a plurality of overlapping coils." Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicants submit that Claim 22, as amended, is novel and non-obvious over Yamanami et al. With respect to the rest of the prior art of record, applicants merely note that none cures the deficiency of Yamanami et al. and, therefore, Claim 22 is allowable over these references also, alone or in any combination with Yamanami et al.

Claim 59 is a method claim that generally corresponds to amended Claim 22. Specifically, Claim 59 recites a method for determining a position of a transducer relative to a surface, wherein "the surface further includes a power transmission coil, which is distinct from the position resolving grid, the power transmission coil being a resonant power transmission coil

and consisting of a plurality of overlapping coils, and the method further comprises: causing the power transmission coil to radiate the electromagnetic field." For the reasons discussed above relative to amended Claim 22, applicants submit that Claim 59 is also allowable over Yamanami et al. and other prior art of record.

The rest of the claims (Claims 51-58 and 60-67) all depend from Claims 22 and 59, respectively. Therefore, these dependent claims are further believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons Claims 22 and 59 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the present application including Claims 22 and 51-67 is in condition for allowance. An early action passing the present application to issue as a patent is respectfully requested. If the Examiner should have any further issues to resolve, she is invited to telephone applicants' undersigned attorney at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}

Sanna Oy No 46,649
for

Shoko I. Leek
Registration No. 43,746
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1780

SIL:cg

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100